

The Sun.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 4, 1899.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, per Month	\$0.50
DAILY, per Year	5.00
SUNDAY, per Year	2.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year	6.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month	.70

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, NEW YORK CITY.

Paris: Rueque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and
Rueque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

The Silver Dollar Bugbear.

From the proposition it advanced last Tuesday that, with the law as it stands, a silverite Administration could, if it so pleased, substitute the silver standard for gold in this country, the *Journal of Commerce* yesterday silently retreated and set up a new bugbear in the shape of the danger of an addition to the currency of the mass of silver dollars which might be coined out of the silver bullion held in the Treasury for the redemption of the Sherman notes of 1890. Here again it exhibits a childish dread of an imaginary danger, and an ignorance of financial law.

The currency of the United States, other than gold, consists of \$340,000,000 of legal tenders, \$480,000,000 of silver dollars and silver certificates, \$93,000,000 of Treasury notes of 1890, and \$241,000,000 of national bank notes, making a total of \$1,144,000,000. Against the \$93,000,000 of notes of 1890, the Treasury holds an equal amount, but the uncoined silver would, if it were coined, produce, say \$130,000,000 of dollars, \$3,000,000 of which would have to be used to retire the Treasury notes, and \$7,000,000 would be seigniorage, so that the total of the country's currency would be raised to \$1,197,000,000, instead of \$1,144,000,000 as at present. This trivial addition of \$53,000,000, the *Journal of Commerce* contends, would cause a depreciation of the whole of the country's \$1,197,000,000 currency, a hoarding of gold, and utter confusion in business. How silly the proposition is, needs no argument for its demonstration.

Furthermore, in the face of its concession on Tuesday that the gold standard now exists, the *Journal of Commerce* repeats its demand for legislation "making one standard." It shuts its eyes to the fact that gold is now legally as well as commercially the only standard, and its clamor for fresh legislation has no excuse.

The Need of Watchfulness Over Santo Domingo.

The despatch of Commander LOGAN of the Machias, in regard to affairs in Santo Domingo, is very satisfactory. He says that "no disorder exists," and that the assassination of HEBREUX is attributed to personal revenge rather than a political plot. It is certain that not the slightest attempt to turn the murder to political account accompanied or followed it.

Yet the Navy Department has been wise in ordering Commander LOGAN to remain at Santo Domingo until further orders. Although FIGUEROA, who succeeded to the Presidency, has thus far met no opposition, there are malcontents both in the island and out of it. Among the exiles the leader is JUAN JIMENEZ, son of a former President. It was he who nearly involved us in trouble during the war with Spain. With other friends of the Cuban cause he was abroad the Fanfa when our Government sent her from Mobile with arms and supplies for the forces of GOMEZ. The Captain was persuaded to go to a Dominican port, where JIMENEZ and others landed and were met by the troops of HEBREUX, a fight between them resulting. He is now in Cuba, and our Government is likely to be watchful lest he should start a filibustering expedition.

Cuba, in fact, from its proximity to Santo Domingo, might be a more favorable base than the United States for such an expedition; and perhaps Hayti, which is now in a disturbed condition, might be employed. Since we have the military possession of Cuba and there is no other Government, we are under obligations to see that the island is not misused for a violation of the neutrality laws.

Another reason why the Machias should remain at Santo Domingo is that a revolution there would call for the prompt protection of America's ships and their property. We do not wish to look after our rights and interests, but we need to be at hand for the general protection of foreign residents, in order that there may not be the slightest excuse for the intervention of European ships.

The precaution may prove superfluous, but it must be taken, since in the tropics revolutions often come as suddenly and furiously as storms, if also they pass as quickly. That the existing Government in Santo Domingo has its enemies may be assumed, and we must not be lacking in vigilance. Meanwhile, the assurances received from Commander LOGAN are all that could be desired.

The Fire Loss in 1898.

A publication of undoubted importance and interest is the "Chronicle Fire Tables," issued yearly by the organ of the fire underwriters. The number for 1899 has just appeared, setting forth the fire losses in the United States during 1898, with details and tables of the fires in that year and in the previous twenty-four years, and various other information relating to fires in this country.

In making up the table of fire losses, thirteen distinct classes of property are considered: dwellings and barns; manufacturing establishments; hotels, clubs and restaurants; warehouses and storerooms; railroad property; theatres and halls; churches; colleges, schoolhouses and convents; goods in transit; public buildings; and hospitals. A class called miscellaneous includes those kinds of property, none of which burns in sufficient quantities to give it a place by itself. In every class except the church class there is an increased number of fires in 1898 over that of 1897. In 1897 there were 735 church fires; in 1898 only 591. The average loss for each fire during the year has been reduced from \$6,222 in 1888 to \$1,808 in 1898; and the insurance loss from \$3,993 to \$1,565, but very remarkable reductions.

Our very natural increase is noted in the number of fires caused by electric wires and lights, in 1898 there were 558,

The average loss has decreased, however, from more than \$10,000 in 1888 to less than \$6,000 per fire in 1898.

Of all causes of fire, defective flues come first as direct causes; they were responsible for 11.23 per cent. of all the fires of last year. Next come incendiaries, responsible for 7.33 per cent. This seems a very large percentage, and argues much crime "unwhipped of justice." It would be interesting to know how large a percentage of the incendiary fires were set by polytheists. Of the 661 incendiary fires in New York 210 were of dwellings, 231 of barns, and of those presumably a large number were started by the insured.

Exposure to fire accounts for 25.68 per cent. of all the fires of 1898. This, however, is an indirect risk. Firecrackers and fireworks caused only .81 per cent. of the fires of last year, while lightning caused 3.70 per cent. Exposures caused more than their share of the total loss, while the losses caused by firecrackers amounted to only .18 of the total. Noisy patriotism is not especially costly.

Coming to the different classes of risks, we find that there were fires during 1898 in 41 electric light stations, in 24 factories where electric light, telephone and telegraph apparatus was made, in 4 stores where electrical appliances were sold and in 20 electric power houses. Eleven artificial ice factories were burned, 12 grand stands, 57 hospitals, 94 clubhouses at wharves, one bicycle warehouse, 33 water tanks, 44 windmills and 2 windmill factories.

The record for twenty-four years places December as the banner month for fire losses. July of last year had the greatest number of fires, 9,572, but December kept its place with a larger loss than any other month.

Studying the direct causes of fires in the United States in 1898, we find that there were 14 dust explosions, 622 fires caused by electric wires and lights, 500 caused by firecrackers, 1,507 forest and prairie fires, 295 caused by friction in machinery, 6,891 incendiary fires, 3,470 fires caused by lightning, 20 caused by mischievous children, and 94 caused by natural gas, of which seven were in State oil stoves.

Of the fires in barns, 307 fires, open hearths, stoves, sparks set, 5,206 fires, spontaneous combustion caused 1,179; there were five fires caused by the sun's rays passing through window glass, and one fire caused by the rays passing through a glass bottle; tramps set 755 fires, not incendiary, and 12,204 fires had no assignable causes.

New York city had no very large fires last year. The largest were in February, when a "general fire" caused a loss of \$235,000, and in December, when a clothing store and office building were destroyed with a loss of \$717,000. The largest fires of the year were in Pittsburgh, in February, when the loss was \$1,428,000, and in Chicago, in May, when the burning of a grain elevator caused a loss of \$1,107,000. No other fires caused a loss of more than one million dollars.

The experience of twenty-four years enables the compilers of the Chronicle Tables to make some unexpected statements. The chief cause of fires in asylums is defective flues; in bakeries, overhead and defective ovens; incendiaries account for most of the fires in hotels and clubs; the most of the fires in billiard rooms, while defective flues cause most of the boarding-house fires; matches start the fires in book stores, spontaneous combustion those in button factories; retail clothing stores suffer chiefly from incendiary fires, while clubs are the fire victims of defective flues. Lamp explosions cause the fires in crockery stores, while incendiaries start most of the theatrical fires. Altogether, incendiaries are responsible for a very large number of fires—so many and with such heavy losses, that it would seem as if the fire insurance companies profitably might combine to suppress it more sharply than they do at present.

How Can There Be Any Doubt?

The question what "gold Democrats" will do in the election next year is agitating some of the journalistic minds representing them. But how can there be any question as to the matter? If they are honestly for gold and believe that the substitution of the silver standard for it would mean business disaster and national degradation they must, of course, vote for a party that favors the maintenance of the gold standard. A Virginia paper says, however, that before the "gold Democrats" vote in accordance with their gold convictions they must have from the Republican Congress an answer to this specific question:

"What do you propose to do at the coming session to put the country on a sound basis that needs no artificial props to keep it afloat?"

Whatever the next Congress proposes to do it will propose in vain if it starts out to do anything of that sort more than has been done already. The ready gold is the legal standard, and it cannot be made any more the standard by the next Congress. That body cannot "put the country on a sound basis that needs no artificial props to sustain it," which the vote of the people may not destroy. It is a question for popular decision only. Whether silver or gold is to be the American standard can only be settled by the popular vote for a President, for members of the House of Representatives and for Legislatures to elect United States Senators. Every "gold Democrat" ought to know that. Every man of any intelligence ought to know it.

It is a foregone conclusion that in the election of 1900 the Democratic party will not sustain the gold standard. Not even the most sanguine "gold Democrat" has the least expectation that the Democratic party will be for gold. The most he hopes for is that it may be induced not to come out plumply for silver. Of the Democratic Congressmen elected in 1899, there is no one in the last four months, and he is still sure that nothing but the intervention of the Almighty will keep BRYAN from being elected. We should like to see CHAMP at the head of the Weather Bureau. If he couldn't furnish pleasant weather, at least his predictions would be pleasant.

The Evening Post, which assumes to speak for the "gold Democrats," says of the "Bryans" that it is "within their power undoubtedly" to win them back. How?

They have only to make a platform in which the Palmer and Buchanan men stand with good conscience in order to secure their votes and induce next year.

What sort of platform is that? A gold platform? The pretended spokesman of the "gold Democrats" makes no such demand, but seems to mean only a platform without it. It is not a platform, but a mere list of names that the silver fanatics may control the convention in such a way as to bring the old issue of 1896 to a gain to the "gold." Even in that case, it assumes to say that it is "not at all likely" that the "gold

Democrats" "will eat their votes or their incomes for silver." If, then, the Democratic party really does declare for gold or positively declares for silver, and the Republican party nominates Mr. McKINLEY on a gold standard, how can men be called "gold Democrats" or gold men of any sort if they will not eat their votes in the only way in which the gold standard can be maintained? What ten thousand difficulties need not make a single doubt, to employ the phrase of a great religious thinker. There is absolutely no conviction of the human mind to which difficulties—and on speculative grounds no slight ones either—may not be objected. The writer who gives his name to the article in the *Post* is a lawyer. He lives in the existence of a material world, I suppose, for he quite outdoes himself in expressing his agnosticism in contemplating the alder and stellar universe; yet he has read beyond the title page of philosophy he must know that there are reasons so grave as to make the profoundest thinkers for believing that nothing extra-mundane exists at all that we are led into thinking that there is such existence from the projecting into exterior visualization of purely subjective states. Despite the difficulties of the philosopher, has he not been practical doubt of the existence of things as we see them? I simply set this down as a check to dogmatic unbelievers and as a safeguard for those who would look on every difficulty as a reason for positive doubt.

HARVARD-FALE OR FALE-HARVARD?

A Suggestion That Seniority Gives Harvard the Title of First Place.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: There appears to be no uniformity of rule in coupling the names of our two leading universities, Harvard and Yale. I find the expression Harvard-Yale in the editorial columns of THE SUN, and Yale-Harvard in its news columns. I also notice that the *Tribune* and other Yale newspapers prefer Yale-Harvard, while the Boston press and Harvard newspapers generally say Harvard-Yale.

This is confusing and misleads people as to the proper position of each university and relative rank. This you will readily perceive if you consider that the Associated Press, in its preliminary report of the athletic contest between the English and American universities, invariably spoke of the Yale-Harvard team. These reports, which were printed in England, gave the impression that Yale was the leading institution in all respects and was so recognized in our country, since in England the question of rank is established by precedence of name. This is always borne out by the Oxford-Cambridge team, or the case may be made out by Oxford's leadership is clearly determined by this.

This may not be an important question, but it should be settled. If there be any reason for giving Yale the precedence, it is that it is older than Harvard, and that it has a longer history. There are weighty reasons for ranking Harvard ahead of Yale. This is not a delicate question, as it is settled by the facts of the case. The facts therein set forth show that Harvard is older than Yale, and that it has a longer history. The facts therein set forth show that Harvard is older than Yale, and that it has a longer history.

"I do not think we should throw ourselves into a state of adulation of a hero because he has won a battle. It hardly strikes me that the Admiral is to be put in the same category with our heroes and other great military heroes. I do not, however, wish to discredit him in the least, but I do protest against making him a second BOLLINGER in America."

Boston is rich in genius, but probably the Hon. MICHAEL BRICK is the only man even in Boston who is capable of regarding DEWEY as another BOLLINGER. Boston should be proud of BRICK and ordain that he be provided with a free lunch of thistles in the playground on School street for the rest of his natural life.

The Yaqui Outbreak.

The news that the Yaqui Indians of Mexico are on the warpath becomes of more interest from the fact that many Americans are among the miners who have been flocking into the Sierra Madre during the past twelve months. The present uprising, in fact, is thought to have been in part due to the opening of the region by the treaty of last year to prospectors.

The Yaqui and Mayo tribes of Sonora have long been a source of great trouble to Mexico from their occasional outbreaks, which generally prove very sanguinary and destructive, as they are fierce fighters. They are an interesting body of Indians, in many respects, and have endured much to secure the independence they covet, but which is beyond their reach. One of their most famous leaders was CAJEME, who rose to the chieftaincy by assassinating his predecessor, and then defied the Mexican Republic for years among the mountains and marshes of Sonora. Many lives of Indians and soldiers have attested the vigor with which these hostilities have been carried on.

This present war will inevitably have the same result as those that have gone before. The Yaquis, as usual, have promptly taken to the thickly wooded mountains, where the advantages which the troops possess in military appliances, including artillery, can be minimized. It is said that on breaking away from their villages on the Yaqui River they massacred the soldiers in the garrison nearby, and then began a general ravaging of the valley, plundering and murdering.

Even if Americans are among the victims of their outbreak, the Mexican Government will not be blamed by our own. It had a few troops at hand and quickly put others in motion. The chief was understood to be peaceable, and in fact is said to have perished in an attempt to quell the outbreak. The Mexican soldiers are well accustomed to campaigning against the Yaquis, and though their task may prove a long one, sooner or later it will be accomplished.

The Hon. Potato Pingree on Newspapers.

In his speech welcoming Gen. ALGER back to Michigan, Governor PINGREE took advantage of the occasion to enunciate one more of those broad and philosophic generalizations which have rendered his name immortal. He said:

"I have come to believe that the institution most dangerous to our form of government is the newspaper."

Sometimes statesmen do not employ language which conveys the exact idea they have in mind.

What the Hon. POTATO PINGREE meant was this: "I have come to believe that the institution most dangerous to POTATO PINGREE's form of government is the newspaper." And he is right.

THE SUN applies the term "the meanest, most dishonest, most unscrupulous of institutions" to the newspaper. It says that "the newspaper is the most dangerous institution to our form of government." It says that "the newspaper is the most dangerous institution to our form of government." It says that "the newspaper is the most dangerous institution to our form of government."

In the way of humor, sarcasm or epigram the idea that this Government has actually purchased the newspaper at two dollars a head might seem to be forgotten when the laugh it raised had faded. When put forth seriously in the manner in which Col. BRYAN advanced it in his speech at Chicago, it becomes denigration of the meanest description.

THE HON. CHAMP CLARK of Missouri is still the most cheerful of men. He is sure that the Democratic party will win the election in 1900, and he is still sure that nothing but the intervention of the Almighty will keep BRYAN from being elected.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I have read your article on the "gold Democrats" and am much interested in it. I am a Democrat, and I am sure that the "gold Democrats" will not eat their votes or their incomes for silver.

Democrat" "will eat their votes or their incomes for silver." If, then, the Democratic party really does declare for gold or positively declares for silver, and the Republican party nominates Mr. McKINLEY on a gold standard, how can men be called "gold Democrats" or gold men of any sort if they will not eat their votes in the only way in which the gold standard can be maintained? What ten thousand difficulties need not make a single doubt, to employ the phrase of a great religious thinker. There is absolutely no conviction of the human mind to which difficulties—and on speculative grounds no slight ones either—may not be objected. The writer who gives his name to the article in the *Post* is a lawyer. He lives in the existence of a material world, I suppose, for he quite outdoes himself in expressing his agnosticism in contemplating the alder and stellar universe; yet he has read beyond the title page of philosophy he must know that there are reasons so grave as to make the profoundest thinkers for believing that nothing extra-mundane exists at all that we are led into thinking that there is such existence from the projecting into exterior visualization of purely subjective states. Despite the difficulties of the philosopher, has he not been practical doubt of the existence of things as we see them? I simply set this down as a check to dogmatic unbelievers and as a safeguard for those who would look on every difficulty as a reason for positive doubt.

A CHRISTIAN TO AN AGNOSTIC.

The Reply of a Believer to the Confession of an Agnostic.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: A great gain would be made in the discussion of religious questions recently begun in your columns, if some one would take the thousand difficulties need not make a single doubt, to employ the phrase of a great religious thinker. There is absolutely no conviction of the human mind to which difficulties—and on speculative grounds no slight ones either—may not be objected. The writer who gives his name to the article in the *Post* is a lawyer. He lives in the existence of a material world, I suppose, for he quite outdoes himself in expressing his agnosticism in contemplating the alder and stellar universe; yet he has read beyond the title page of philosophy he must know that there are reasons so grave as to make the profoundest thinkers for believing that nothing extra-mundane exists at all that we are led into thinking that there is such existence from the projecting into exterior visualization of purely subjective states. Despite the difficulties of the philosopher, has he not been practical doubt of the existence of things as we see them? I simply set this down as a check to dogmatic unbelievers and as a safeguard for those who would look on every difficulty as a reason for positive doubt.

The agnostic confessor agrees with the author of "First Principles" and with all his best agnostic colleagues in saying that his God is "unknown and unprovable." Yet, astonishing as it may seem, he proceeds to give us this knowledge of Him: He is, 1. "The Supreme Being," 2. "The Supreme Being," 3. "The Supreme Being," 4. "The Supreme Being," 5. "The Supreme Being," 6. "The Supreme Being," 7. "The Supreme Being," 8. "The Supreme Being," 9. "The Supreme Being," 10. "The Supreme Being," 11. "The Supreme Being," 12. "The Supreme Being," 13. "The Supreme Being," 14. "The Supreme Being," 15. "The Supreme Being," 16. "The Supreme Being," 17. "The Supreme Being," 18. "The Supreme Being," 19. "The Supreme Being," 20. "The Supreme Being," 21. "The Supreme Being," 22. "The Supreme Being," 23. "The Supreme Being," 24. "The Supreme Being," 25. "The Supreme Being," 26. "The Supreme Being," 27. "The Supreme Being," 28. "The Supreme Being," 29. "The Supreme Being," 30. "The Supreme Being," 31. "The Supreme Being," 32. "The Supreme Being," 33. "The Supreme Being," 34. "The Supreme Being," 35. "The Supreme Being," 36. "The Supreme Being," 37. "The Supreme Being," 38. "The Supreme Being," 39. "The Supreme Being," 40. "The Supreme Being," 41. "The Supreme Being," 42. "The Supreme Being," 43. "The Supreme Being," 44. "The Supreme Being," 45. "The Supreme Being," 46. "The Supreme Being," 47. "The Supreme Being," 48. "The Supreme Being," 49. "The Supreme Being," 50. "The Supreme Being," 51. "The Supreme Being," 52. "The Supreme Being," 53. "The Supreme Being," 54. "The Supreme Being," 55. "The Supreme Being," 56. "The Supreme Being," 57. "The Supreme Being," 58. "The Supreme Being," 59. "The Supreme Being," 60. "The Supreme Being," 61. "The Supreme Being," 62. "The Supreme Being," 63. "The Supreme Being," 64. "The Supreme Being," 65. "The Supreme Being," 66. "The Supreme Being," 67. "The Supreme Being," 68. "The Supreme Being," 69. "The Supreme Being," 70. "The Supreme Being," 71. "The Supreme Being," 72. "The Supreme Being," 73. "The Supreme Being," 74. "The Supreme Being," 75. "The Supreme Being," 76. "The Supreme Being," 77. "The Supreme Being," 78. "The Supreme Being," 79. "The Supreme Being," 80. "The Supreme Being," 81. "The Supreme Being," 82. "The Supreme Being," 83. "The Supreme Being," 84. "The Supreme Being," 85. "The Supreme Being," 86. "The Supreme Being," 87. "The Supreme Being," 88. "The Supreme Being," 89. "The Supreme Being," 90. "The Supreme Being," 91. "The Supreme Being," 92. "The Supreme Being," 93. "The Supreme Being," 94. "The Supreme Being," 95. "The Supreme Being," 96. "The Supreme Being," 97. "The Supreme Being," 98. "The Supreme Being," 99. "The Supreme Being," 100. "The Supreme Being," 101. "The Supreme Being," 102. "The Supreme Being," 103. "The Supreme Being," 104. "The Supreme Being," 105. "The Supreme Being," 106. "The Supreme Being," 107. "The Supreme Being," 108. "The Supreme Being," 109. "The Supreme Being," 110. "The Supreme Being," 111. "The Supreme Being," 112. "The Supreme Being," 113. "The Supreme Being," 114. "The Supreme Being," 115. "The Supreme Being," 116. "The Supreme Being," 117. "The Supreme Being," 118. "The Supreme Being," 119. "The Supreme Being," 120. "The Supreme Being," 121. "The Supreme Being," 122. "The Supreme Being," 123. "The Supreme Being," 124. "The Supreme Being," 125. "The Supreme Being," 126. "The Supreme Being," 127. "The Supreme Being," 128. "The Supreme Being," 129. "The Supreme Being," 130. "The Supreme Being," 131. "The Supreme Being," 132. "The Supreme Being," 133. "The Supreme Being," 134. "The Supreme Being," 135. "The Supreme Being," 136. "The Supreme Being," 137. "The Supreme Being," 138. "The Supreme Being," 139. "The Supreme Being," 140. "The Supreme Being," 141. "The Supreme Being," 142. "The Supreme Being," 143. "The Supreme Being," 144. "The Supreme Being," 145. "The Supreme Being," 146. "The Supreme Being," 147. "The Supreme Being," 148. "The Supreme Being," 149. "The Supreme Being," 150. "The Supreme Being," 151. "The Supreme Being," 152. "The Supreme Being," 153. "The Supreme Being," 154. "The Supreme Being," 155. "The Supreme Being," 156. "The Supreme Being," 157. "The Supreme Being," 158. "The Supreme Being," 159. "The Supreme Being," 160. "The Supreme Being," 161. "The Supreme Being," 162. "The Supreme Being," 163. "The Supreme Being," 164. "The Supreme Being," 165. "The Supreme Being," 166. "The Supreme Being," 167. "The Supreme Being," 168. "The Supreme Being," 169. "The Supreme Being," 170. "The Supreme Being," 171. "The Supreme Being," 172. "The Supreme Being," 173. "The Supreme Being," 174. "The Supreme Being," 175. "The Supreme Being," 176. "The Supreme Being," 177. "The Supreme Being," 178. "The Supreme Being," 179. "The Supreme Being," 180. "The Supreme Being," 181. "The Supreme Being," 182. "The Supreme Being," 183. "The Supreme Being," 184. "The Supreme Being," 185. "The Supreme Being," 186. "The Supreme Being," 187. "The Supreme Being," 188. "The Supreme Being," 189. "The Supreme Being," 190. "The Supreme Being," 191. "The Supreme Being," 192. "The Supreme Being," 193. "The Supreme Being," 194. "The Supreme Being," 195. "The Supreme Being," 196. "The Supreme Being," 197. "The Supreme Being," 198. "The Supreme Being," 199. "The Supreme Being," 200. "The Supreme Being," 201. "The Supreme Being," 202. "The Supreme Being," 203. "The Supreme Being," 204. "The Supreme Being," 205. "The Supreme Being," 206. "The Supreme Being," 207. "The Supreme Being," 208. "The Supreme Being," 209. "The Supreme Being," 210. "The Supreme Being," 211. "The Supreme Being," 212. "The Supreme Being," 213. "The Supreme Being," 214. "The Supreme Being," 215. "The Supreme Being," 216. "The Supreme Being," 217. "The Supreme Being," 218. "The Supreme Being," 219. "The Supreme Being," 220. "The Supreme Being," 221. "The Supreme Being," 222. "The Supreme Being," 223. "The Supreme Being," 224. "The Supreme Being," 225. "The Supreme Being," 226. "The Supreme Being," 227. "The Supreme Being," 228. "The Supreme Being," 229. "The Supreme Being," 230. "The Supreme Being," 231. "The Supreme Being," 232. "The Supreme Being," 233. "The Supreme Being," 234. "The Supreme Being," 235. "The Supreme Being," 236. "The Supreme Being," 237. "The Supreme Being," 238. "The Supreme Being," 239. "The Supreme Being," 240. "The Supreme Being," 241. "The Supreme Being," 242. "The Supreme Being," 243. "The Supreme Being," 244. "The Supreme Being," 245. "The Supreme Being," 246. "The Supreme Being," 247. "The Supreme Being," 248. "The Supreme Being," 249. "The Supreme Being," 250. "The Supreme Being," 251. "The Supreme Being," 252. "The Supreme Being," 253. "The Supreme Being," 254. "The Supreme Being," 255. "The Supreme Being," 256. "The Supreme Being," 257. "The Supreme Being," 258. "The Supreme Being," 259. "The Supreme Being," 260. "The Supreme Being," 261. "The Supreme Being," 262. "The Supreme Being," 263. "The Supreme Being," 264. "The Supreme Being," 265. "The Supreme Being," 266. "The Supreme Being," 267. "The Supreme Being," 268. "The Supreme Being," 269. "The Supreme Being," 270. "The Supreme Being," 271. "The Supreme Being," 272. "The Supreme Being," 273. "The Supreme Being," 274. "The Supreme Being," 275. "The Supreme Being," 276. "The Supreme Being," 277. "The Supreme Being," 278. "The Supreme Being," 279. "The Supreme Being," 280. "The Supreme Being," 281. "The Supreme Being," 282. "The Supreme Being," 283. "The Supreme Being," 284. "The Supreme Being," 285. "The Supreme Being," 286. "The Supreme Being," 287. "The Supreme Being," 288. "The Supreme Being," 289. "The Supreme Being," 290. "The Supreme Being," 291. "The Supreme Being," 292. "The Supreme Being," 293. "The Supreme Being," 294. "The Supreme Being," 295. "The Supreme Being," 296. "The Supreme Being," 297. "The Supreme Being," 298. "The Supreme Being," 299. "The Supreme Being," 300. "The Supreme Being," 301. "The Supreme Being," 302. "The Supreme Being," 303. "The Supreme Being," 304. "The Supreme Being," 305. "The Supreme Being," 306. "The Supreme Being," 307. "The Supreme Being," 308. "The Supreme Being," 309. "